



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov  
DW Oct-06

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP  
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE  
SUITE 200  
SUNNYVALE CA 94085

COPY MAILED

OCT 27 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :  
Gotkis et al. :  
Application No. 10/672,019 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Filed: 26 September, 2003 :  
Atty Docket No. LAM2P437 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 24 July, 2006, under 37 CFR 1.137(b),<sup>1</sup> to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is GRANTED.

The application became abandoned on 5 January, 2006, for failure to timely file a proper response to the final Office action mailed on 5 July, 2005, which set a three (3) month shortened statutory period for reply. A Request for Reconsideration was

<sup>1</sup> Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application, abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

filed on 10 November, 2005 (certificate of mailing date 7 November, 2005), and Advisory Action stating the period for reply expired four (4) months from the mailing of the final Office action was mailed 23 November, 2005. A two (2) month extension of time and an additional amendment after final rejection were filed on 9 January, 2006 (certificate of mailing date 5 January, 2006). An Advisory Action was mailed on 31 January, 2006. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 22 February, 2006.

Petitioners have filed an amendment after final rejection as the required reply. As the examiner has determined that the amendment places the case in condition for allowance, the response may be favorably considered.

This application is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 2859 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571)272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions